(f) if so, what was the import during the last three years, year-wise along with names of the parties and average CIF price;

(g) whether it is also a fact that Anthelmintics group$_s$ of drags are under price control;

(h) if so, whether this drug has been included in the schedule; and

(i) if so, when and if not, what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICALS AND PETROCHEMICALS (SHRI R. K. JAICHANDRA SINGH): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) M/s. Hoechst India Ltd. were granted an industrial Licence No. CIL: 201(83) dated 30-5-83 for the manufacture of 3.5 tonnes per annum of Fanbenaa-zole (a veteraiary Anthelmintics) from basic stage.

(c) Yes, Sir.

(d) Production details to the $_e$xlent available are as under:

1983 .... 0.56 tonnes

1984 ... 096tonnes

1985 . . . .Nil (Jan. to Oct.)

(e) Yes, Sir.

(f) Details of import during the last three years, year-wise, alongwith c.i.f. value are given below:

Year	Quantity imported	c.i.f. Value (Rs./Lakhs)
1983	7535 Kgs.	162.28
1984	23750 Kgs.	415.44
1985 (Jan. to October)	7500 Kgs.	123.65

Party-wise details are not available.

(g) Yes, Sir.

(h) and (i) Similar information has been furnished to Rajya Sabha i$_n$ reply to Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 2310 dated 19th August, 1985.

Complaints against M[s. E. Merck (India) Ltd.

2191. SHRI (MOLANA) ASRARUL HAQ; Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have received complaints regarding Import of Chemicals by M|s. E. Merck (India) Limited about their unfair business practices;

(b) if so, when were these complaints received;

(c) whether those- complaints were investigated;

(d) if so, when was final decision taken along with the details of the decision and main grounds of each complaim;

(e) whether it is also a fact that the company is still adopting»unfair business practices; and

(f) if so, what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICALS AND PETROCHEMICALS (SHRI R. K. JAICHANDRA SINGH); (a) and (b) Yes, Sir. Complaints were received in 1983.

(c) Yes, Sir.

(d) to (f) In the portion of the com plaint relating to chemicals it was alleged that M|s. E. Merck India Limited were, (a) importing certain chemicals *on* licen ces of third parties and merely repacking them and selling them under the name of Merck India Limited, (b) the purchase

of raw materials from abroad was done through the purchase department of Merck Darmstard and, (c) that 80 per cent to 90 per cent of items marketed as Laboratory Chemicals by Merck India are repacked straight either from imported or indigenous raw materials.

The matter was taken up with the corn-par, y who has clarified that more than 40 qualified chemists are working on Laboratory Chemicals. The company has denied the allegation that they are merely repacking the imported or indigenous raw materials and stated that their activities involve highly sophisticated technology and conforms to the industrial licence issued to them for laboratory chemicals and re-agents. The company has also clarified that the purchase of raw materials is not made through the purchase department of M/s. Merck Darmstard (the for-eign collaboration) and that they have their own purchase department through which they organise all purchases. The company has further clarified that in terms of licence for laboratory chemicals granted to them, no unfair business practices is being adopted.

Show cause notice for marketing products without price approval

2192. SHRIMATI MONIKA DAS: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether his attention wa$_s$ drawn to the news item captioned 'show cause no tices to 2 drug companies' which appeared in the 'Financial Express' of 21st Novem ber, 1985;

(b) whether it is $_a$ fact that Government have issued nonces *to* drug companies who are marketing their products without obtaining price approval;

(c) if so, names of the companies and when it came to the notice of Government that each of thos$_e$ companies have crossed the exempted limit of sales turn over of Rupees Fifty lacs per annum;

(d) whether it is also a fact that there are number of drug companies who are marketing their products without price approval even when the sales turn over of each of 'heir predicts has crossed Rupees one crore; and

(e) if $_s$o, names of such products and their manufacturers?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICALS AND PETROCHEMICALS (SHRI R. K. JAI-CHANDRA SINGH); (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) to (e) A large number of notices have been issued to the drug manufacturing companies for *prima facie* not obtaining price approval even after crossing the limit of Rs. 50 lakhs in sales turnover. Names of such companies were given in reply to Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1557 answered on 2nd December, 1985. Names of the products of such companies having sales turnover of Rs. 1 crore or more $^{nave\ not}$ been identified a$_s$ the sales turnover of formulations is not monitored.

Show cause notices to drug manufacturers

2193. SHRIMATI MONIKA DAS: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refer to the answer to the Unstarred Question 188 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 18th November, 1985 and state:

(a) when were the show cause notices issued to Burroughs Wellcome, Pfizer and Glaxo and when were the explanation of each company received;

(b) what were the main grounds on which each show cause notice was issued;

(c) what are the bulk drugs involved in each case and what is the permitted capacity of each company as well as what was the production of each company during the last three years; year-wise;

(d) whether it is a fact that these companies did not implemented the prices fixed by Government for those drugs and have been charging their own prices up-till today;

(e) whether it is also a fact that over charging is the main consideration of these companies for unauthorised excess pro-